


the last response. The rejection of Claim 6 in the above-noted rejection was allegedly based upon 35 U.S.C. 102(e), however the language of the rejection is that used in rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). In addition, although there was reference to the "Pavelcheck, et al. reference, no application of that reference is found. In view of the substance of the rejection, and any confusion that may exist therein, if the Examiner wishes to reinstate Claim 6 as active, he may do so by Examiner's amendment. However, Applicants do not wish to delay allowance of Claims 1 – 5, 18 and 20.


Please address all future correspondence concerning this application to the undersigned at 6136 West Kimberly Way, Glendale, AZ85308.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Thomas A. Beck  
6136 West Kimberly Way  
Glendale, AZ 85308  
(860) 921-1358

I certify that this amendment is being mailed via the United States Postal Service, first class mail, postage prepaid, on the date shown below addressed to: *Assistant Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 72313-1450.*

Thomas A. Beck



April 21, 2007